UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/831,335	09/28/2001	Jacques Mallet	ST 98036-US-PCT	3243

23117 7590 06/16/2005

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER	
AKHAVAN, RAMIN	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1636	

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/831,335	MALLET ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ramin (Ray) Akhavan	1636	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 March 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *20-38* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *20-38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt is acknowledged of a response, filed 03/21/2005, amending claims 20, 22-24, 26, and 28, as well as adding new claim 38. All objections/rejections not repeated herein are hereby withdrawn. Where applicable, a response to Applicant's arguments will be set forth immediately following the body of any objections/rejections repeated herein.

It is noted that claim 28 was inadvertently omitted in the section heading of a rejection set forth in the previous Office Action (Action, mailed 12/23/2004, at page 7, Rejection Nos. 3 and 4). It is further noted that the section heading erroneously set forth a rejection under § 102, where the rejections are set forth under § 103 (Action, p. 6; rejection heading, p. 7). The rejections are maintained herein, with modification to include all applicable claims and correction of the rejection heading. As a result, this action is nonfinal. Any additional new grounds of rejection are necessitated by material changes to the claims. Claims 20-38 are currently pending and under consideration in this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. **Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

This is a new ground of rejection. Claim 38 recites the phrase, "cells according to claim 24" which confers ambiguity as to the claim's bounds.

Nowhere does claim 24 or ultimately independent claim 20 recite cells as is recited in instant claim 38. Each of the claims 20, 23, 24 (from which claim 38 depends) is directed to a nucleic acid molecule, not a cell. Does Applicant mean a composition comprising a cell comprising *nucleic acids according to claim 24*. In sum, as written, the claim's metes and bounds are indeterminable.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 20-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

This is a new ground of rejection. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. More particularly, all the claims[1] are directed to the limitation recited in independent claim 21 – i.e., "[t]he first promoter and the nucleic acid of interest are not on the same gene." It does not appear that the specification provides support for this negative limitation, nor has Applicant pointed to any passage/line providing such support. As such, **the limitation "not on the same gene" constitutes NEW MATTER**.

[1] Claim 38 is interpreted as being directed to cells comprising *nucleic acids according to claim 24*.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. **Claims 28-33, 35-36 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bujard et al. (US 5650298; see whole document; hereinafter '298 patent), further in view of Corti et al. (NeuroReport, 1996; 7:1655-1659).**

This rejection is of record but is modified herein to include all applicable claims. The '298 patent teaches a tetracycline-regulated expression system to be inserted into a mammalian cell (e.g. mouse) by means of homologous recombination. (e.g. Abstract, Fig. 13A-B, col. 5, ll. 1-25). As is explicitly depicted in Figs. 13A and B, the '298 patent teaches a nucleic acid molecule comprising the tTA expression system comprises kilobase size fragments of the gene of interest, which would intrinsically contain the required promoter region. For example, a

transcriptional terminator is located downstream (e.g. Figs. 13A-B), after which in the same orientation is a gene of interest under control of a minimal phosphoglycerate kinase (PGK) promoter (Id.). Further, it is explained that a DNA construct contains a fusion of sequences that normally flank the endogenous gene and contain promoter sequences are fused to the tTA system. (col. 20, ll. 16-22).

Alternatively, the tetracycline-regulated system can be under spatial and temporal control of the β-actin promoter. (e.g. col. 23, l. 2). Furthermore, the construct comprises a third region, which is arranged in between which restricts transcriptional interference, e.g. tTA transactivator. (col. 20, last ¶ bridging to col. 21). In addition, the protein of interest that can be thus regulated can be virtually any desired protein, including growth/nutrition related proteins such as erythropoietin, growth hormone, dystropin and tyrosine hydroxylase (e.g. col. 28, ll. 50-60). Therefore, the '298 patent anticipates the rejected claims. The '298 patent also teaches that the second promoter can be a CMV minimal promoter (i.e. without enhancer elements) that contain up to seven tetOP elements. (e.g. col. 5, ll. 60-66; col. 6, ll. 55-65).

The '298 patent does not teach the additional embodiments drawn to the transcription terminator being an upstream mouse sequence (UMS), that 1-10 sequences of the tet-responsive (tetOP) elements are present in the second promoter which is a minimal CMV promoter and that an isolated nerve cell can contain the claimed nucleic acid molecule borne in a recombinant adenovirus. Further, the '298 patent, although indicating any human cell can be any mammalian cell, does not expressly indicate nerve cell, nor does the '298 patent indicate that the tet-expression system taught, can be incorporated in an adenoviral vector. Lastly, the '298 patent doesn't specifically indicate that the transcription terminator can be a UMS, but does indicate

that any suitable transcription terminator (affecting the tet-regulated expression) as known in the art can be used. (e.g. col. 21, ¶ 1).

Corti et al. generally teaches a tet-expression system (tTA system) in nerve cells. More particularly, Corti et al. teach a construct that comprises the tTA system under control of a CMV promoter as well as a reporter gene under a minimal CMV promoter with the two transcription units being separated by a UMS sequence, all oriented in the same direction. Corti et al. teach a tetracycline regulatory system for the regulation of genes introduced into the CNS. (e.g. p. 1658, col. 2, last ¶).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of skill to use the UMS transcription terminator in the tetracycline-expression system as taught by the '298 patent. One of skill would have been motivated to make this minor modification by virtue of the express statement in the '298 patent that other transcription terminators can be used. As Corti et al. teach, the UMS transcription terminator was well known at the time of invention. Therefore, the artisan would have been motivated to use transcription terminators, such as UMS, to expand the range of terminators to be used in the tTA-regulated system. Given the skill and knowledge at the time of invention, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success to use the UMS as one of many transcription terminators in the tTA-regulated system.

In addition, Corti et al. indicate that the vector-borne tTA system can be used in nerve cells. The '298 patent indicates that the tTA system taught can be used in any mammalian cell. Either the '298 patent or Corti et al. teach a vector-borne tTA system, with the only variation in the constructs being that Corti et al. teaches the first promoter being a viral CMV promoter.

However, this variation is also explicitly taught in the '298 patent. (e.g. col. 22, last ¶ bridging to col. 23; indicating that the first promoter can be a constitutive promoter such as CMV, as is also taught by Corti et al.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to use the '298 patent's vector-borne tTA system in nerve cells. One of skill would have been motivated to do such, so as to broaden the scope of potential cells in which the tTA system can be used to regulate gene expression. Given the skill and knowledge at the time of invention, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success to utilize a tTA system as taught by the '298 patent in nerve cells.

4. **Claims 28-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bujard et al. (US 5650298; see whole document; hereinafter '298 patent) and Corti et al. (NeuroReport, 1996; 7:1655-1659), further in view of Hu et al. (Can. Res. 1997; 57:3339-3343).**

This rejection is of record, but is modified herein to include all applicable claims. Additional embodiments are directed to the tTA system being on an adenoviral vector. Neither the '298 patent or Corti et al. teach that the vector comprising the tTA system can be an adenoviral vector. However, Hu et al. teach a tTA system comprised on an adenovirus vector. Just as in the construct taught by Corti et al. and the '298 patent, the Hu et al. construct contains a pCMV constitutive promoter driving tTA and a tTA-responsive promoter, the minimal CMV promoter driving a gene of interest. (e.g. p. 3340, Fig. 1).

Therefore all three references teach a tTA system for gene expression. It would have been obvious to incorporate the tTA system in an adenovirus as a vector to effectuate use of the tTA system in a particular cell.

Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so to obtain the benefit of expanding the range of cells that can be transfected using the tTA regulatory construct. Given the knowledge and skill at the time of invention, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success to incorporate the tTA regulatory construct of either the '298 patent or Corti et al. in an adenoviral vector as taught by Hu et al.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ray Akhavan whose telephone number is 571-272-0766. The examiner can normally be reached between 8:30-5:00, Monday-Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Remy Yucel, PhD, can be reached on 571-272-0781. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571-273-8300 for regular communications and 703-872-9307 for After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Respectfully submitted,

Ray Akhavan/AU 1636

Daniel M. Sullivan
Patent Examiner